

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Dox 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/088,534	06/28/2002	Thierry Romanet	02058	9256	
23338	7590 09/30/2003				
DENNISON, SCHULTZ & DOUGHERTY			EXAMINER		
	1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ARLINGTON, VA 22202		POLITZE	POLITZER, JAY L	
		•	, ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2856		
			DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003	}	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No	o. Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/088,534	ROMANET ET	ROMANET ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Jay L Politzer	2856				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on the cov	er sheet with the correspondence	address			
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comr period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 period for reply is specified above, the maximum st re to reply within the set or extended period for reply eply received by the Office later than three months a department adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, hor nunication. 0) days, a reply within the statutory matutory period will apply and will expir will, by statute, cause the application	wever, may a reply be timely filed ninimum of thirty (30) days will be considered to second the second date of the to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	his communication.			
1) 🖂	Responsive to communication(s) fi	led on 12 January 2003 .					
2a)⊠		2b)☐ This action is non-	-final.				
3)□							
Dispositi	on of Claims	, ,					
4)🖂	Claim(s) $\underline{1-12}$ is/are pending in the	application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
•	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or election requir	rement.	,			
	ion Papers			•			
,—	The specification is objected to by th						
10) 🗌 🤄	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)	The proposed drawing correction file		ved b) disapproved by the Exa	miner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)	a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 						
* (national Bureau (PCT Rule	e 17.2(a)).	nai Stage			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
) The translation of the foreign la Acknowledgment is made of a claim						
Attachmen	•	, .	<u> </u>				
2) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) F		Interview Summary (PTO-413) Pape Notice of Informal Patent Application Other:				

Serial Number: 10/008,534

Art Unit:

2856

Title:

METHOD AND APPARATUS USING HEAT FLUX TO DETECT OR

MEASURE A DEPOSIT LIABLE TO FORM IN A FLUID-

TRANSPORT PIPE

Filed:

6/28/02

Inventor(s):

Romanet et al

DETAILED ACTION

REJECTIONS OVER PRIOR ART UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States."

2. Claims 1, 3-9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hausler.

Regarding Claims 1 and 8; a thermal gradient at 2, is formed by heating coil 11 to create the active zone 3. Heat flux is measured by thermocouples 14, 15, 20 and others at Col 4, Li 12-17. Processing and control means are depicted in Fig 3.

Regarding Claims 3-4, 6 and 11; see Col 3, Li 38-41.

Regarding Claim 5; see Col 4, Li 12-17.

Regarding Claim 7 and 9; see Col 1, Li 60 bridging Col 2, Li 23.

Serial Number: 10/008,534

Art Unit: 2856

REJECTIONS OVER PRIOR ART UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

"A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person."

4. Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hausler as applied to claims 1 and 8, above, in view of Ludington et al, hereinafter Ludington.

Regarding Claim 2 and 10; Hausler fails to cycle the heat source. Ludington teaches the value of cycling the heat source at Col 20, Li 63 bridging Col 21, Li 27 wherein the heat capacitance is obtained from the amplitude (peak). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to cycle the heat source because Ludington teaches that more information is in a cycled source.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hausler as applied to claim 8, above, in view of Ivanets et al, hereinafter Ivanets.

Serial Number: 10/088,534

Art Unit: 2856

Regarding Claim 12; Hausler fails to use a band for the measurement sensors. Ivanets in the sole figure uses a band for the measurement sensors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a band for the measurement sensors to avoid penetrating the pipe.

FINAL ACTION:

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

REMARKS:

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/26/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Hausler's thermocouple 15 is positioned in the liquid flow. Fig 1 clearly shows this is not the case. Thermocouple 20 is in the liquid flow but is only used to compensate for the temperature of the liquid.

Serial Number: 10/088,534

2856

Art Unit:

Applicant argues that Hausler's metal piece is exposed to the liquid. So is the rest of the pipe.

Applicant argues that Hausler's thermocouples are not longitudinally displaced from each other. Fig 1 clearly shows that thermocouples 14 and 15 are longitudinally displaced.

Applicant argues that Ludington is not applicable.

This argument is not understood. Both Hausler and

Ludington are in the same class and both involve heat

transfer. Ludington shows the value of cycling the

heat source to obtain more information.

Applicant argues that Ivanets is not applicable.

Ivanets is relied upon only to add a flexible band.

The fact that Ivanets does not measure in the same way as Hausler is not relevant.

INQUIRIES:

- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Jay L. Politzer whose telephone number is (703) 305-4930 and whose facsimile number is (703) 308-7382
- 9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Hezron E. Williams, can be reached at (703) 305-4705.
- 10. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

Serial Number: 10/088,534

Art Unit:

2856

jlp 9/8/03

127

HEZRON WILLIAMS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800